



## **HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION HEARING SYNOPSIS**

**WEDNESDAY MARCH 5, 2008**

### **Study Session**

CEQA: How to Review an EIR

5:00 p.m. – T-332

### **Regular Session**

**6:00 P.M.**

**Council Wing, Rooms W-118 & 119**

200 East Santa Clara Street

San José, CA

### **COMMISSION MEMBERS**

**EDWARD JANKE, AIA, CHAIR**

**PATRICIA COLOMBE, VICE CHAIR**

**HELENE LAVELLE    SCOTT CUNNINGHAM**

**DANA PEAK    JUDY STABILE**

**ERIC THACKER**

**JOSEPH HORWEDEL, DIRECTOR**

**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, BUILDING AND CODE ENFORCEMENT**

## NOTE

To arrange an accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act to participate in this public meeting, we ask that you call (408) 277-4576 (VOICE) or (408) 998-5299 (TTY) at least two business days before the meeting. If you have questions or concerns, please contact Sue Diehl at (408) 535-7855.

## NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

Good evening, my name is **Ed Janke**, and I am the Chair of the Historic Landmarks Commission. On behalf of the Commission, I would like to welcome you to tonight's meeting. I will now call to order the **March 5, 2008** meeting of the Historic Landmarks Commission. Please remember to turn off your cell phones and pagers.

If you want to address the Commission, **fill out a speaker card (located at the technician's station), and give the completed card to the technician. Please include the agenda item number for reference.**

### **The procedure for public hearings is as follows:**

- After the staff report, *applicants may make a five-minute presentation.*
- Anyone wishing to speak in favor of the proposal should prepare to come forward. After the proponents speak, anyone wishing to speak in opposition should prepare to come forward. *Each speaker will have two minutes.*
- Commissioners may ask questions of the speakers. These questions will not reduce the speaker's time allowance.
- The Commission will then close the public hearing. The Historic Landmarks Commission will take action on the item.

### **The procedure for referrals is as follows:**

- Anyone wishing to speak on a referral should prepare to come forward. *Each speaker will have one minute.*
- Commissioners may ask questions of the speakers. These questions will not reduce the speaker's time allowance.
- The Historic Landmarks Commission will comment on the referral item.

**If a Commissioner would like a topic to be addressed under one of the Good and Welfare items, please contact Planning staff in advance of the Commission meeting.**

An agenda and a copy of all staff reports have been placed on the table for your convenience.

**AGENDA**  
**ORDER OF BUSINESS**  
**6:00 PM SESSION**

**1. ROLL CALL**

**2. DEFERRALS**

Any item scheduled for hearing this evening for which deferral is being requested will be taken out of order to be heard first on the matter of deferral. If you want to change any of the deferral dates recommended or speak to the question of deferring these or any other items, you should say so at this time.

**The matter of deferrals is now closed**

**3. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC**

**The consent calendar items are considered to be routine and will be adopted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a request is made by a member of the Historic Landmarks Commission, staff or the public to have an item removed from the consent calendar and considered separately. If anyone in the audience wishes to speak on one of these items, please make your request at this time.**

**The Consent Calendar is now closed.**

**4. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- a. [Addition to the San José Historic Resources Inventory](#) of the single family residence identified as eligible for the Inventory as a Structure of Merit in the review of a Special Use Permit application (File No. SP08-006) for the demolition of one single-family detached residence to allow subdivision into six (6) lots, located on the southwest corner of Willow Glen Way and Creek Drive (660 Willow Glen Way) on a 0.878 gross acre site. (Masoumi Bros. LLC, Applicant). Council District: 6. SNI: None. CEQA: In Process. *Project Manager, A. Baty*

**Staff Recommendation:** Historic Landmarks Commission adopt a Resolution listing the Qualifying Property on the City of San José Historic Resources Inventory as a Structure of Merit as recommended by staff.

**DEFERRED TO 4-2-08**

## **5. REFERRALS FROM CITY COUNCIL, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS OR OTHER AGENCIES**

- a. [First Amendment to the Park View Towers DEIR \(Response to Comments\)](#) located on the north side of East St. James Street between North First and North Second Streets, (H05-029, HP05-002, HP05-003). The project includes the demolition of Contributing Structure Letcher's Garage, rehabilitation of Contributing Structure First Church of Christ Scientist, and construction of a mid-rise residential project within the St. James Square Historic District. (San Jose Redevelopment Agency, Owner; Barry Swenson Builder, Developer). Council District: 3. SNI: None. *Project Manager, L. Butler*

**Staff Recommendation:** Historic Landmarks (HL) Commission to review the First Amendment to the EIR and provide comment to HL Commissioner appointed to speak at the DEIR certification Planning Commission hearing on behalf of the HL Commission.

### **CONTINUED FROM 12-5-07**

*Akoni Daniels, Principal Planner, presented the item indicating the First Amendment to the draft EIR had been completed. The Amendment provides the responses to the comments received from the Commission and the Preservation Action Council and associated text revisions that were made in response to the comments. He requested that the Commission consider the responses and text revision to determine if issues remain unresolved from the Commission's perspective. The First Amendment included two additional design alternatives.*

*Commissioner Colombe voiced disagreement with the response in the Amendment suggesting the 70 foot height alternative was a less than significant impact. She felt it did not meet the design criteria of the District and very likely the Secretary of the Interior Guidelines for construction in historic districts. She understood that CEQA does not require that all of the alternatives maintain the same level of density as the project proposes. She would have liked to have seen an alternative with less density.*

*Commissioner Cunningham requested clarification on the structural system. Christy Reynolds with Barry Swenson Builders explained a core structure system would have to be used because of the design change.*

*Commissioner Stabile questioned how the District Guidelines and the Downtown Strategy Plan worked together. Specifically, the Downtown Strategy says the buildings on the Park should be tall. Throughout the response to the Commission's comments, the terms "high rise" and "tall" are used synonymously. The term in the Downtown Strategy is "tall high density." Commissioner Colombe agreed the Amendment gives greater credence to the Downtown Strategy than it does to the District Guidelines.*

*Commissioner Stabile did not feel the Amendment provided response to her previous concern regarding the historical buildings bordering the District. The response did not treat the impact of the tall buildings on these resources. These buildings include the Armory which is a designated Historic Landmark, the St. James Hotel, Germania Hall, and the Moir Building, all of which are located within 100 to 110 feet of the proposed building. Chair Janke agreed the Amendment did not provide response to the impact of the tall buildings to these close buildings of historical importance. He did concede the issue was eluded to but not embellished in the*

*Commission's November letter. Commissioner Colombe voiced support for the issue and questioned why those buildings were not addressed in the EIR. Michelle Yesney of David J. Powers & Associates, the Environmental Consultant, reminded the Commissioners the Amendment was a supplement, not a free standing EIR. She indicated the Initial Study contains discussion addressing the kind of development assumed to be built in the area other than within the District. The assumption was that new buildings would be up to 180 feet tall, which is the maximum height currently allowed by FAA standards. Commission Stabile reiterated that her opinion as a Historic Landmarks Commissioner remained that the towers are not appropriate on this particular site.*

*Commissioner Colombe felt that it would be more appropriate to have a 70 foot height addition that had a set back. She conveyed the Guidelines indicate the height of adjacent new construction should not be more than one story higher than the historic resource. She felt the 70 foot block was more than one story higher than the church, perhaps not the top of the dome but higher than the bulk of the church. She felt argument could be made that the alternative does not meet the Design Guidelines for the Historic District.*

*Commissioner Cunningham requested clarification on the timeline for completing the rehabilitation of the church. Akoni Danielsen indicated the timing would be identified in the Site Development permit. The permits will come back to the Commission with draft language for the group to comment on. The rehab of the church is a part of the proposed project and should be done at the time of the building of Tower I. The rehab of the church will not reduce the impacts to Letcher's to less than significant and, therefore, does not qualify as mitigation. Commission Peak felt that argument could be made for CEQA purposes that not rehabbing the church could lead to its deterioration and potential demolition. Christy Reynolds stated that the applicant's DDA with the Agency requires rehab of the Church.*

*Commission Colombe pointed out that the Commission had previously commented the addition of a tower on Letcher's was in their opinion a significant impact on the building. She voiced concern that the writer did not see that as a significant impact on a historic building. Planning staff directed her to the exhibit, illustrating Tower II adjacent to Letcher's rather than on top of it, at which point she reconsidered her comment.*

*Commissioner Cunningham commented that the DEIR only looked at alternatives that retained the proposed number of units and did not look at reduced-size alternatives. Commissioner Colombe agreed reduced-size alternatives are legitimate under CEQA, which for this project would achieve a better relationship at the front of Tower II and a better relationship to the church without increasing the height of the tower. Commissioner Cunningham indicated a smaller building would allow lower costs and may provide the developer with the required return on their investment.*

*Commissioner Stabile will take HLC comments to Planning Commission including: The Response to Comments did not address the overall visual and spatial impacts to the Historic Buildings across the street from the Tower I and Tower II; and More reduced density alternatives should be included, including a 70-foot alternative that is stepped back to meet the District Guidelines.*

- b. [\*\*Japantown Corporation Yard Mixed Use Residential Project \(PDC07-073\) Draft Environmental Impact Report \(DEIR\)\*\*](#) located at 696 North 6<sup>th</sup> Street and 675 North 6<sup>th</sup> Street. The proposed project would include up to 600 market-rate residential units, up to

30,000 square feet of retail space, a 10,000 to 20,000 square foot community amenity space, and up to 900 underground/surface parking spaces on the Corporation Yard site. As a variation on the proposed project, up to 15,000 square feet of retail space may be replaced with up to 24 live/work units. (Williams & Dame Development and First Community Housing, Developer). Council District: 3. SNI: None. *Project Manager, D. Chundur*

**Staff Recommendation:** Historic Landmarks Commission to provide comment and consider authorization of the HLC Chair to sign a DEIR comment letter on behalf of the commission, to the Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement.

#### **CONTINUED FROM 2-6-08**

*This item was continued from the February 6, 2008 HLC meeting. Clarification to questions asked in that meeting was provided by staff. The Commission was asked to summarize their comments on the EIR to be forwarded to the Director through the synopsis or via letter.*

*Leslie Masunaga representing the Japantown Community Congress indicated they were preparing a letter addressing concern about the vibrations on identified area buildings and the disposition of historic archeological findings that the construction might uncover. Additionally, minor changes and corrections about the history of the area will be recommended.*

*Ms. Zarnowitz referenced issue raised at the February 6, 2008 meeting regarding the status of some of the structures in the area. She reported there were no designated City Landmarks on the Sixth Street side of the project.*

*Another issue raised at the February 6, 2008 meeting was the height of the proposed construction and the impact it would have on the scale of the setting of the identified Historic District resources on the west side of North Sixth Street. Extensive discussion ensued between staff and Commissioners Colombe, Janke, and Cunningham to determine the height and design that would mitigate the impact. The Commission agreed with the discussion in the EIR that there could potentially be an impact with relationship to the new construction to the existing. However, they did not feel the recommended mitigation brought the impact to less than significant. The Commission came to the consensus that the following mitigations would reduce the impact to less than significant: The first floor of residential above the commercial should have a setback of 10 feet; the second floor of residential should have a setback of an additional 10 feet; additional residential floors could go full height after that. Language could be included about each of the setbacks and how they could be articulated so as not to form one continuous line.*

*Commissioner Stabile recommended that an Existing General Plan alternative including a public park/plaza located in the center of the site as in the proposed project (accessed from North Sixth and North Seventh Streets) be explored and analyzed in order to include a wider range of alternatives.*

**MOTION APPROVED TO APPOINT CHAIR JANKE TO WORK WITH STAFF TO DRAFT A LETTER REFLECTING THE COMMISSION'S COMMENTS TO THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING. (6-0-1, Thacker absent)**

- c. [Draft Evergreen-East Hills Development Policy](#) for the area generally located southerly of Story Road and Easterly of State Route 101, including the 14 gross acre Mirassou Winery site located on Aborn Road. Council District: 5, 7 and 8. SNI: K.O.N.A., East Valley/689 and Evergreen. CEQA: ADSEIR In Process. *Project Manager, R. Matthew*

**Staff Recommendation:** Historic Landmarks Commission to forward comments to the Director of Planning on key preservation issues to be included in the draft Evergreen-East Hills Development Policy.

#### **TO BE TAKEN OUT OF ORDER FOLLOWING CONSENT CALENDAR**

*Project Manager Reena Mathew presented the item, requesting the Commission's input on: 1) Criteria for historic resources under the Evergreen-East Hills Development Policy; 2) Development guidelines for properties or project components abutting or in proximity to historic resources; 3) Criteria for acceptable maintenance and adaptive reuse of historic resources; and 4) Professional qualifications and guidelines required to evaluate and reduce impacts to the context and setting of historic resources.*

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

*Judi Henderson, representing PAC San Jose, recommended the landscape evaluation of the Mirassou Property be done as part of the process. Further she asked that funds be set aside for surveying of historic properties in Evergreen and throughout the entire City.*

*Eric Schoennauer, Land Use Consultant representing Trumark Companies on the Mirassou property, indicated it was their goal to find the appropriate balance between new development and preservation to make the site work in all regards. He pointed out that historic preservation takes money, and the number of housing units does matter to make it financially feasible to protect those structures. The rationale for allowing more units than 35 is to generate the financial capability to invest in the historic resource.*

#### **COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS:**

*Commissioner Peak indicated there are specific historic preservation guidelines already in place for the City of San Jose. She felt it was inappropriate to provide special criteria that would apply to only a specific area. A Historic Context Statement and Historic Resources Survey for Evergreen would be appropriate.*

*Requiring designation of any Candidate City Landmarks utilizing the policy should also be considered.*

*Commissioner Cunningham raised the issue of the agricultural land surrounding the historic buildings. He felt preserving or restoring the agricultural component was important as it relates to the historical resources and their original setting. He additionally commented on there being no inventory of the properties to be considered which puts the Commission at a disadvantage when providing comment.*

*Commissioner Colombe voiced support for providing additional guidelines for this benefit. She indicated the Evergreen Specific Plan showcases the historic buildings from Aborn Road and shows vineyards as landscaping and as a historic frame for the buildings. Building housing in front of the Mirassou buildings would degrade the value of these buildings and their setting.*



*She felt preserving the setting would be critical to protecting those historic resources. As a criteria she recommended when the setting adds to the historic past and identification of the area, the historic resource and setting relationship to the street be preserved.*

*Commissioner Thacker voiced concern regarding customized programs for historic preservation that are not part of an overall strategy for the City. He agreed incentives were good but relayed concern about the patchwork incentive programs that might result. He felt the goal should be a uniform policy that is applied citywide. Additionally, he addressed the issue of determining which sites should be eligible for inclusion in the Policy. Agreeing with Commissioner Cunningham, he felt this task could not be accomplished without a survey of the historic properties in the district. He felt it was imperative to understand what resources exist before making decisions on allocations of the allotment of units.*

*Speaking to the issue of development incentives, Commissioner Peak indicated there are currently a number of incentives in place for historic preservation, one of the major ones being the Mills Act. She felt units in excess of 35 would intensify the site and be inappropriate.*

*Ms. Zarnowitz directed the Commission's attention to the portion of the memo that addresses the Standards, noting that San Jose resources that are Candidate City Landmarks and/or eligible for the California Register are required to meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards in order to reduce impacts to less than significant, but Structures of Merit are not. The Commission could provide comment on whether the Policy should address rehab of and new construction adjacent to only CEQA historic resources or also to Structures of Merit.*

*Commissioner Colombe voiced support for including Structures of Merit explaining it would be an opportunity to add a layer of historic preservation quality. She recommended an additional criterion to consider would be to apply the Secretary of the Interior Standards to Structures of Merit within the project. She qualified her statement by asking the Commission's opinion on whether structures that have a very low rating would warrant the additional housing units. Would there be a cut off point?*

*Responding to a question posed by Commissioner Colombe on whether structures that have a very low rating would warrant the additional housing units, Commissioner Thacker reiterated the need for a survey. He indicated a survey showing the entire context of the historic resources would allow both quantitative and qualitative judgments for determining whether incentives are warranted or not.*

*Commissioner Cunningham brought up the issue of density in proximity to a historical resource or height limits within 100 feet of the property line of a historic resource. He suggested such criteria as a 26 foot height limit within 100 feet of the property line of a historic resource, 8 to 10 units per acre within a certain radius of the historic property, and then density increased conforming to what is allowed in that zoning district would be appropriate.*

*Commissioner Stabile indicated her most important criteria would be that the historic resource is improved before the occupancy permits are issued.*

*Commissioner Colombe recommended additional consideration be focused on restrictions of setbacks surrounding a historic resource. She felt the front and sides of the resources could warrant more restrictions than the back of the structure, though this would vary on a case-by-case basis. Commissioner Peak suggested one solution could be to correlate the restrictions to*



*the significance level of the resource. As well, other specifics in terms of development could be individualized within the PD zoning requirements.*

*Commissioner Thacker recommended a criterion requiring that the identified resources be varied and representational of the district's historic resources so the character of the area would be preserved.*

*Laurel Prevetti informed the Commission that budget constraints would not allow for a survey, even on a limited scale. As an alternative to survey work, Commissioner Peak suggested the use of Metro Scan or using aerial data that might identify parcels that are differentiated from the normal subdivision layout that might suggest where there may be historic structures.*

*In response to staff's request for feedback on criteria the Commission felt was acceptable for maintenance and adaptive reuse of historic resources, Commissioner Colombe recommended the use and adaptive reuse be compatible with the surroundings and in accordance with existing City policy. Conversely, the new development should be compatible with the use of the historic resource. In terms of acceptable maintenance, she recommended there be guarantees in the project that the historic resource will be maintained at a certain level and over an identified time frame with specific criteria for that maintenance.*

- d. **"Cultural Citizenship Tree"** temporary public art project. The proposed outdoor exhibit would be installed in the southwest corner of St. James Park for a period of one year.

**Staff Recommendation:** Historic Landmarks Commission to review and forward comments to the Director of Public Art

**TO BE TAKEN OUT OF ORDER  
FOLLOWING ITEM 5.c. AND CONSENT CALENDAR**

*Barbara Goldstein, Public Art Director, described the project to the Commission. The 14 foot fiberglass Cultural Citizenship Tree would be located in the southwest corner of St. James Park for one year beginning May 2008. The Commission requested that additional information depicting the entire final project be provided before making comment.*

- e. **H07-030.** Site Development Permit for a mini-storage facility located on the northwesterly corner of Curtner Avenue and Stone Avenue. The project includes the demolition of a tank house identified as a Structure of Merit and the construction of a 133,250 square foot mini-storage facility, including a caretaker's residence, on a 4.42 gross acre site. (Applicant: Extra Space Storage). Council District: 7. SNI: None. CEQA: In Process. *Project Manager, C. Burton*

**Staff Recommendation:** Historic Landmarks Commission to make a recommendation to the Planning Director regarding the disposition of the identified historic resource.

*Christopher Burton, Project Manager, presented the item.*

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

*The owner, Christine Blank, and three of her children, Jeff Blank, Sheri Burns and Greg Blank, all spoke in support of the demolition of the structures. The family cited various reasons*

*supporting their position including the dilapidated condition of the structures, vandalism, a gathering place for vagrants and drug dealers, and theft that had occurred.*

*Del Dietrich, Broker with American Commercial Reality, representing the property owner explained the one structure eligible for inclusion on the Historic Resource Inventory, the tank house, was evaluated to see if they could mitigate by keeping the structure as situated. It was felt leaving the structure where it is would impact the project significantly. The second mitigation considered was relocating the tank house to another location on the property. Jim Salada from Garden City Construction inspected the tank house in terms of its integrity. It was his opinion that due to significant deterioration the “add on” structures would not stand up to relocation. The tank house itself could potentially be moved, but not without having to cut it into pieces and at cost estimated at \$125,000-\$175,000. Taking away the space that the tank house would occupy from the mini-storage space, it was estimated the impact to the project would be about \$500,000 with no guarantee that the Tank House could be maintained in the move. Under this scenario, the buyer indicated they would pull out of the project. They also raised the issue of who would be responsible to maintain the structure, provide security and assume liability.*

#### COMMISSIONER’S COMMENTS:

*Commissioner Colombe asked if consideration had been given to leaving the tank house where it is, carving out a corner of the proposed building as a niche for the tank house, rehabbing it and using it as the office. The space identified in the drawing for the office within the new construction could be converted to storage space. She suggested “flipping over” the front building and parking, making the tank house visible from the street and right behind the parking lot. It would be very visible, unique and interesting.*

*The Real Estate Agent with Richie Company representing the buyer indicated that mitigation was considered but determined to be cost prohibitive.*

*Chair Janke asked for the total cost of construction and was told between \$16-17 million. The parties were unable to provide projected costs for rehabbing the tank house. Chair Janke agreed that the existing tank house could work as an element of the project.*

*Commissioner Peak inquired why only the tank house was being considered as a Structure of Merit and the other buildings on the property were not. Staff indicated the other structures had been significantly altered thereby creating an integrity issue in terms of severe alternations. Robert Cartier, Historic Consultant, added though the tank house is not in pristine condition, it has more points associated with it. It is somewhat unique in that the lower part is built on three sides. It is a very different caliber resource than the other structures on the property.*

*Commissioner Colombe requested clarification on the environmental review for the project. Staff indicated that the project will be found exempt under Categorical Exemption 15332 for In-Fill Development Proposals. Commission Colombe voiced her concern that the tank house, as well as other structures throughout the city, could be demolished under a Categorical Exemption.*

**MOTION APPROVED TO ASK STAFF TO PURSUE THE POSSIBILITY OF PRESERVING THE TANK HOUSE IN ITS CURRENT LOCATION AND TO DISPLACE THE FRONT CORNER OF THE MAIN BUILDING OF THE PROPOSED**

**CONSTRUCTION TO PROVIDE AN ALCOVE FOR THE TANK HOUSE;  
APPLICANT TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL INFORMATION ON REHABbing THE  
TANK HOUSE. 6-0-1, Thacker absent.**

- f. [Finding of No Adverse Effect](#) as required by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), for King and Dobbin Transit Village Planned Development Rezoning PDC07-015 which allows up to 1,287 residential units, between 10,000 to 25,000 square feet of commercial space, and an approximately one-acre park, located on the northeasterly side of North King Road, approximately 640 feet southerly of Mabury Road. (Various, Owner/San Jose Transit Village Partners, LLC) Council District: 3. CEQA: EIR. NEPA: EIS. *Project Manager, D. Chundur*

**Staff Recommendation:** Historic Landmarks Commission to provide comment on a Finding of No Adverse Effect to be forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Officer and consider addition of the National Register eligible house located at 12320 Mabury Road to the Inventory in a future public hearing.

*Commissioner Cunningham stated he concurred with the Finding of No Adverse Effect on the subject structure on Lot 10, 12320 Maybury Road. Chair Janke was in agreement.*

**MOTION TO PROVIDE COMMISSION'S COMMENT OF FINDING OF NO EFFECT  
TO THE STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER ADOPTED (5-0-2, Thacker  
and Stabile absent)**

**6. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

- a. Public comments to the Historic Landmarks Commission on non-agendized items. Each member of the public may address the Commission for up to two minutes. The Commission cannot take any formal action without the item being properly noticed and placed on an agenda. In response to public comment, the Historic Landmarks Commission is limited to the following options:
1. Responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public; or
  2. Requesting staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting; or
  3. Directing staff to place the item on a future agenda

*Sue Cucuzza, legal agent and property manager for Dr. Joseph Covey in the Remillard House City Landmark, located at 755 Story Road, spoke to inform the Commission and concerned or interested citizens of the status of this historical site. She indicated the owner's intent was to maintain the premises and to live out his life there. As the owner's agent, she requested any communication be directed to her.*

**7. GOOD AND WELFARE**

- a. Report from Secretary, Planning Commission, and City Council  
*No report.*
- b. Commissioners' report from Committees:
1. Design Review Subcommittee (Janke, Colombe and Cunningham; Lavelle alternate)  
February 20, 2008 Meeting Cancelled  
*No report.*

2. History San Jose Collections Committee (Stabile)

*Commissioner Stabile reported the organization must move from the Stockton Warehouse and consequently will be deaccessioning many items. Information will come before the Commission in April.*

3. Coyote Valley Specific Plan and Habitat Conservation Plan Advisory Committee (Cunningham)

*Commissioner Cunningham reported the draft EIR for the new Gavilan College Campus is now online.*

4. Japantown Survey Committee (Lavelle)

*Commissioner Lavelle reported the group met for a planning session. There will be a community meeting coming up but the date has not yet been set.*

5. Pellier Park Committee (Colombe)

*No report.*

6. City of San Jose BART extension, Design, Art & Architecture Review (Janke)

*Commissioner Janke indicated the possibility of BART coming to San Jose is now uncertain.*

7. GP Update Task Force Progress Report (Colombe and Thacker)

*The Commission felt it was important to put effort into deciding what the Commission will tell the Task Force at the appropriate time. Suggestions such as study sessions, placing discussion on a future agenda as an ongoing topic, and placing the work on the workplan were considered.*

c. [Review of 02/06/08 HLC Synopsis](#)

*Commissioner Colombe requested clarification of the project reviewed by the DRC, which was an addition to 1819 Park Avenue. She asked in the future the project name for items reviewed by the DRC appear in the synopsis so that Commissioners do not have to refer back to their packet. **THE SYNOPSIS AS REVISED WAS APPROVED (4-0-3, Thacker and Peak absent, Cunningham abstain)***

d. Status of Circulation of Environmental Review Documents

<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning/eir/>

▪ Demolition of the San José Medical Center ADEIR

July 2007 NOP Distribution

*The Commission will see the DIR when it begins circulation.*

▪ Morrisson Park PD Rezoning (PDC06-094) DMND

*The Commission saw this as an ND. There have been some changes to some of the conclusions and mitigations resulting in re-circulation of the document.*

▪ Japantown Corporation Yard

Anticipated 21 April 2008 DEIR Hearing

▪ Coleman/Autumn Improvement Project EIR

30 January 2008 PC Hearing

Anticipated 5 March 2008 HRI Additions

*Staff will bring back additions to the Inventory on a future agenda.*

▪ Park View Towers (H05-029, HP05-002, HP05-003) DEIR

*Commissioner Stabile will be providing the Commission's comments to the Planning Commission on 3/12/08.*

e. Study Session Dates and Topics

1. February 6<sup>th</sup> – Planning Department Website Re-design
2. March 5<sup>th</sup> – CEQA: How to Review an EIR

*Topics suggested for future Study Sessions included the GP Update, Work Plan, and presentation on mid-century buildings.*

f. California Preservation Foundation Conference – Napa, CA

Wednesday, April 23, 2008 – Saturday, April 26, 2008

*Registration for Commissioners will be paid by PBCE. Certified Local Government Training and AIA Continuing Education credits are available for attendance.*

g. Historic Preservation Month May 2008

h. [City Council/Commission Code of Conduct and Provisions Regarding Absences](#)

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

*The meeting was adjourned at 10:22 p.m.*

## 2007 HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE

DATE	TIME	TYPE OF MEETING	LOCATION
January 9, 2008	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Subcommittee	Room T-550
February 6, 2008	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room W118-119
February 20, 2008	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Subcommittee	Cancelled
March 5, 2008	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room W118-119
March 19, 2008	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Subcommittee	Cancelled
April 2, 2008	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room W118-119
April 16, 2008	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Subcommittee	Room T-550
May 7, 2008	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room W118-119
May 21, 2008	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Subcommittee	Room T-550
June 4, 2008	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room W118-119
June 18, 2008	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Subcommittee	Room T-550
August 6, 2008	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room W118-119
August 20, 2008	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Subcommittee	Room T-550
September 3, 2008	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room W118-119
September 17, 2008	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Subcommittee	Room T-550
October 1, 2008	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room W118-119
October 15, 2008	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Subcommittee	Room T-550
November 5, 2008	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room W118-119
November 19, 2008	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Subcommittee	Room T-550
December 3, 2008	6:00 p.m.	Regular Meeting	Room W118-119
December 17, 2008	12:00 p.m.	Design Review Subcommittee	Room T-550

HISTORIC LANDMARKS AGENDA ON THE WEB:  
<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning/hearings/historic.asp>